



California

**NOT OFFICIAL
UNTIL APPROVED AT SUBSEQUENT
MEETING BY CITY COUNCIL**

CITY OF OCEANSIDE

JOINT MINUTES OF THE:

CITY COUNCIL SMALL CRAFT HARBOR DISTRICT BOARD OF DIRECTORS COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

MAY 6, 2009

REGULAR MEETING 4:00 PM COUNCIL CHAMBERS

4:00 PM - OCEANSIDE CITY COUNCIL (COUNCIL),
HARBOR DISTRICT BOARD OF DIRECTORS (HDB), AND
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION (CDC)
- REGULAR BUSINESS

Mayor
HDB President
CDC Chair
Jim Wood

Deputy Mayor
HDB Vice President
CDC Vice Chair
Vacant

Councilmembers
HDB Directors
CDC Commissioners
Jerome Kern
Jack Feller
Esther Sanchez
Rocky Chavez

City Clerk
HDB Secretary
CDC Secretary
Barbara Riegel Wayne

Treasurer
Gary Felien

City Manager
HDB Chief Executive Officer
CDC Executive Director
Peter Weiss

City Attorney
HDB General Counsel
CDC General Counsel
John Mullen

For this regular and joint meeting, the Council sat as all 3 governing bodies [Council, HDB and CDC] simultaneously but took action as the respective agency for the jurisdiction covered by each item. Council titles only will be used for brevity throughout the entire meeting.

4:00 PM - ROLL CALL

The meeting was convened at 4:02 PM. Present were Mayor Wood and Councilmembers Feller, Chavez, Sanchez and Kern. Also present were City Clerk Wayne, City Attorney Mullen and City Manager Weiss.

CITY COUNCIL, HDB, and CDC CLOSED SESSION ITEMS

CONFERENCE WITH LABOR NEGOTIATOR – Negotiator: City Manager; employee organizations: Oceanside Police Officers’ Association (OPOA), Oceanside Firefighters’ Association (OFA), Oceanside Police Management Association (OPMA), Management Employees of the City of Oceanside (MECO), Oceanside City Employees’ Association (OCEA), Oceanside Fire Management Association (OFMA), Western Council of Engineers (WCE), and Unrepresented]

No closed session was held.

2. **CONFERENCE WITH REAL ESTATE NEGOTIATOR (SECTION 54956.8)**

Property: Property bounded by Pacific Street, Myers Street, Seagaze Drive, and Civic Center Drive (APN 147-261-01 through 12; 147-076-1, 2, 3, 10, 11, 12); Negotiating Parties: SD Malkin Properties; Negotiator for the City: Jane McVey, Economic and Community Development Director, Delmar Williams and Paul Marra; Under Negotiations: Terms of Disposition Agreement and Lease

Discussed; the Disposition Agreement has been signed by SD Malkin, and the Agreement includes the lease as an exhibit to the document. That document will be brought forward for a CDC public hearing anticipated for June 17, 2009.

3. **CONFERENCE WITH REAL ESTATE NEGOTIATOR (SECTION 54956.8)**

CONFERENCE WITH REAL ESTATE NEGOTIATOR – Property: approximately 7 acres at the intersection of Rancho del Oro Drive and Ocean Ranch Boulevard (APN 160-572-10 and portion of APN 162-082-43); Negotiating Parties: City of Oceanside and Ivey Ranch Development Company; Negotiator for the City: Douglas Eddow, Real Estate Manager; Under Negotiations: price and terms for the acquisition and/or exchange of property by the City

Discussed; there was no reportable action.

5:00 P.M. – ROLL CALL

The regular and joint meeting of the Oceanside City Council (Council), Small Craft Harbor District Board of Directors (HDB) and Community Development Commission (CDC) was called to order at 5:02 PM, May 6, 2009 by Mayor Wood.

Present were Mayor Wood and Councilmembers Feller, Chavez, Sanchez and Kern. Also present were City Clerk Wayne, City Manager Weiss, City Attorney Mullen and City Treasurer Felien.

INVOCATION – by Pastor Carl Souza

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE – by Parks & Recreation indoor soccer team members

PROCLAMATIONS AND PRESENTATIONS

Presentation – Leslee Gaul of the California Welcome Center regarding upcoming beach soccer tournament

Proclamation – Census Bureau – for 2010 Census

[Presentation – Eagle Scout Darren Tokheim] – absent

Presentation – Mayor’s Youth Sports Recognition and Appreciation Award–Oceanside P & R indoor soccer team

Presentations were made.

CLOSED SESSION REPORT

4. **Closed Session report by City Attorney**

CITY ATTORNEY MULLEN reported out on the items heard in closed session. See Items 2 and 3 above for reports.

PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS ON OFF-AGENDA ITEMS

No action will be taken by the City Council/HDB/CDC on matters in this category unless it is determined that an emergency exists or that there is a need to take action that became

known subsequent to the posting of the agenda.

Advance written request to reserve time to speak: None

5. **Communications from the public regarding items not on this agenda**

DONNA MCGINTY, 2405 Mesa Drive, expressed her displeasure that the new senior center will not include a kitchen for hot meals for seniors until the second phase of construction.

KIRA FOX, 1609 Hunsaker Street, invited everyone to Pacific View Charter School's 10th anniversary celebration of the school next Tuesday evening at their Ocean Ranch Boulevard site.

CATHY NYKIEL, representing MainStreet Oceanside, reviewed the Freedom Days parade to be held June 27, the Sunset Market events, etc.

MARC PUCKETT, member of the North County Alano Club, 4198 Mission Road, noted their mission is to support all the various 12-step programs, i.e. Alcoholics Anonymous, Narcotics Anonymous, Gamblers Anonymous, Nicotine Anonymous, Food Addition Anonymous, etc. We are a tremendous resource for the community. We also need to apply for grants due to their aging facilities.

JIMMY KNOTT, 127 Sherri Lane, thanked those who helped during the last days of his sister's life.

DAVID NYDEGGER, President/CEO of the Chamber of Commerce, reviewed the Operation Appreciation event to be held on May 16.

CONSENT CALENDAR ITEMS [Items 6-14]

All items listed on the Consent Calendar are considered to be routine matters or formal documents covering previous City Council/HDB/CDC instructions. The items listed on the Consent Calendar may be enacted by a single vote. There will be no separate discussion of any Consent Calendar items unless requested by members of the City Council/HDB/CDC or the public through submittal of Request to Speak form prior to the commencement of this agenda item.

CITY CLERK WAYNE removed Item 10 from the Consent Calendar for discussion due to a public request to speak.

The following Consent Calendar items 6-9 and 11-14 were submitted for approval.

6. City Council/Harbor/CDC: Acceptance of Joint Minutes of the Small Craft Harbor District Board of Directors, Community Development Commission and City Council of the March 18, 2009, 4:00 p.m. Regular Meeting
7. City Council/Harbor/CDC: Approval to waive reading of the text of all ordinances and resolutions considered at this meeting and provide that ordinances shall be introduced after a reading only of the title(s)
8. City Council: Approval of plans and specifications for traffic signal and streetlight pole modifications on Coast Highway at Civic Center Drive, at Pier View Way, and between Civic Center Drive and Pier View Way, and authorization for the City Engineer to call for bids
9. City Council: Approval of a purchase order in an amount not to exceed \$35,579.05 to Pacific Parking Systems, Inc., of Irvine for the purchase of two pay machines for City parking lots, and authorization for the Financial Services Director, or designee, to execute the purchase order
10. **Removed from the Consent Calendar for discussion**

11. City Council: Approval of Amendment 2 [**Document No. 09-D0279-1**] in the amount of \$79,036 to the professional services agreement with Foothill Associates of San Diego for additional work to complete the Subarea Plan of the Multiple Habitat Conservation Plan and present the final to City Council in 2009, and authorization for the City Manager to execute the amendment; and approval of a budget appropriation in the amount of \$40,000 from the Buena Vista Creek Major Water Course District 3 Fund 530 Unallocated Fund Balance to the project account
12. City Council/CDC: Approval of a budget appropriation in the amount of \$747,997 from the Redevelopment Fund balance to pay to the Education Revenue Augmentation Fund (ERAF) for FY 2008-09 in accordance with AB 1389, legislation that was passed with the State budget

CITY ATTORNEY MULLEN clarified that the requirement to pay ERAF was based on AB 1389 which was declared unconstitutional by the Superior Court in Sacramento County last Thursday. We are still coming forward requesting the authorization, but we want to make it clear that the authorization would be contingent upon a final judicial determination of the constitutionality of AB 1389.

13. City Council: Acceptance of improvements constructed by Grindline Skateparks, Inc., of Seattle for the Oceanside Skateparks Project located at Melba Bishop and Martin Luther King Jr. Parks, and authorization for the City Clerk to file the Notice of Completion [**Document No. 09-D0280-1**] with the San Diego County Recorder
14. City Council: Adoption of **Resolution No. 09-R0281-1**, "... authorizing the application for grant funds in the amount of \$600,000 to the FY 2010 Transportation Development Act and Transnet Bicycle and Pedestrian Grant Program for the San Luis Rey River Trail Extension Phase 2"

COUNCILMEMBER KERN moved approval (of Consent Calendar Items 6-9 and 11-14); **COUNCILMEMBER CHAVEZ** seconded the motion.

Motion was approved 5-0. [Item 10 trailed]

GENERAL ITEMS

General Items are normally heard after any 6:00 p.m. Public Hearing Items. However, if time permits, some General Items may be heard prior to any 6:00 p.m. Public Hearing Items, following the Consent Calendar.

19. **City Council: Adoption of a resolution approving temporary road closures, no-parking areas, and traffic-flow plans between the hours of 4:00 a.m. on July 3 and Midnight on July 4, 2009, in various locations and at various times within the area bounded by The Strand to the west, Coast Highway to the east, Oceanside Boulevard to the south, and Harbor Drive to the north to facilitate the movement of pedestrian and vehicular traffic during the Fourth of July festivities and enhance public safety (the closure of one parking lot is the only restriction going into effect on July 3); introduction of an ordinance amending Chapter 4 of the City Code by the addition of Section 4.16 prohibiting dogs on The Strand between Breakwater Way and Wisconsin Street during the time that the Coastal Safety Enhancement Zone is in effect; and approval of a budget appropriation in the amount of \$45,000 from the General Fund Unallocated Fund Balance to the Police Department for assistance from the California Highway Patrol and San Diego County Sheriff's Office**

FRANK McCOY, Police Chief, stated we are asking for approval for pretty much the same plan as we had brought forward last year. That plan was very successful and allowed us to provide security for those visiting our beach area. The other issue we discussed last year, but did not get the ordinance adopted, was prohibiting dogs on The Strand, and that ordinance is before Council this evening. The other item is the addition of \$45,000 to help pay for outside law enforcement to assist us, which was very successful in our efforts to provide a very safe 4th of July for our residents and visitors.

COUNCILMEMBER FELLER asked for the total cost. The staff report says we are expecting about 150,000 people, and we have no fireworks. Also what are the costs for the day?

CHIEF McCOY recalled that last year it was in the range of \$35,000-\$40,000, so it would be an additional \$35,000+ for our overtime costs in addition to the \$45,000.

CITY MANAGER WEISS believed the total for staff time, which is in the operating budget, is around \$140,000 total for everyone including police, fire, harbor, public works, etc. The difference is that without having the fireworks, we expect that the crowds in the evening will dissipate earlier so people will not be working as late as they have in the past.

COUNCILMEMBER FELLER moved approval [of staff's recommendations including adoption of **Resolution No. 09-R0285-1**, "...approving temporary road closure, parking, and traffic plans for July 3 and 4, 2009, in the beachfront area", and introduction of an ordinance titled "...amending Chapter 4 of the Oceanside City Code by the addition of Section 4.16 prohibiting dogs on The Strand between Breakwater Way and Wisconsin Street during the time the Coastal Safety Enhancement Zone is in effect"]

COUNCILMEMBER KERN seconded the motion.

COUNCILMEMBER SANCHEZ asked if the suggestions from last year to make it better have been incorporated, including access for residents on Pacific Street and The Strand, beachgoers, handicapped, etc.

CHIEF McCOY stated the residents' feedback was taken into consideration in our plan, and we were able to accommodate some of the items, such as boat renters having access to their boats. There were complaints that people could not come down with their vehicles to pick up their beach gear, but that is something we cannot accommodate until the crowds dissipate to a point where we feel it is safe to allow vehicles down there. We will accommodate folks as much as possible. We had no complaints from those with handicapped placards; they were and will be accommodated. We will continue to accommodate residents who live in the area. One place where we cannot is for those that live on The Strand and that is their access. During this time it is unsafe for any vehicles to travel on The Strand. The residents on Pacific Street and everyone west of the railroad tracks had pretty much free access to those streets. We have some road closures where we restrict parking based on the staging areas and there will be minor impacts on those in those particular areas, but there was parking on Pacific Street and in the associated parking lots. We will do everything we can to accommodate residents with the least amount of impact.

MAYOR WOOD noted there are no fireworks and wanted to make sure that information is put out to the public ahead of time and for those parking outside of the zone and walking in, he hopes there will be notification on the signs well before they get to the beach. Let people know before they get to the beach that there will be no fireworks.

CHIEF McCOY responded we will make sure that happens. Staff does have a plan in place for notifications, including the newspaper.

Motion approved 5-0.

20. **[City Council/CDC: Approval of two professional services agreements with MainStreet Oceanside for the production and maintenance of the Daytime and Sunset Markets for FY 09-10, at no cost to the City; and authorization for the Executive Director/City Manager to execute the agreement.]**

This item was continued to the June 17 meeting.

CITY MANAGER ITEMS

22. **Update on swine flu precautions**

JOE URBAN, Consulting Assistant for Fire Department, gave a brief update on the H1N1 virus, which is unique to us because it is composed of an avian flu, a human flu and a

swine flu from North America. In addition there is a swine flu component from Asia, which we have never seen in the human population and is one of the worrisome points; we haven't had previous exposure to it so our bodies cannot fight it efficiently. Also it is human-to-human transmission. Discussion was held. He further reviewed the recent updates and the precautions to take.

6:00 P.M. – PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS

Public hearing items are "time-certain" and are heard beginning at 6:00 p.m. Due to the time-certain requirement, other items may be taken out of order on the agenda to accommodate the 6:00 p.m. public hearing schedule.

15. **City Council: Approval of the FY 2009-2010 Action Plan of the 2005-2010 Consolidated Plan for Housing and Community Development; authorization to submit the FY 2009-2010 Action Plan to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development; approval of an additional appropriation in the amount of \$20,000 in FY 2009-2010 Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds to the Oceanside Boys and Girls Club Gangbusters program; and deobligation of FY 2009-10 CDBG funds for two capital projects for later consideration as CDBG-Recovery Act projects**

- A) Mayor opens public hearing – public hearing was opened
- B) Mayor requests disclosure of Councilmember and constituent contacts and correspondence – disclosures were reported
- C) City Clerk presents correspondence and/or petitions – no correspondence was received
- D) Testimony, beginning with:

JOHN LUNDBLAD, Management Analyst, reported that before Council is one ordinary item, one routine, one correction of a staff mistake and one correction of staff overzealousness.

The Action Plan is an annual document detailing how we plan to use CDBG and the Home Investment Partnership funds. This includes all the decisions Council has made since March, and this is the final document and requires final approval and authorization for signature by the City Manager and the submission to HUD in Los Angeles. The error is that when Council approved the CDBG budget in March, it was clear that it was to duplicate the public services allocations of this current fiscal year for the next year since it is the second year of a 2-year program. Staff neglected to proofread that -- thus the Boys and Girls Club Gangbuster program was listed as \$2,308 instead of \$22,000. Council's approval is requested to correct the error.

The last item is that the 2 projects for the Oceanside Senior Center and the Family Recovery Center were done before we got the final guidelines for all the CDBG Recovery Act projects. In those guidelines, which were published yesterday, it clearly states that all Recovery Act actions must be clearly designated as separate and distinct actions by the Council. So we need to de-obligate so that staff can return to Council soon in order to get the proposal back to HUD by June 5, the deadline.

Public input

With no input received, the hearing was closed.

COUNCILMEMBER SANCHEZ has been making some calls about the Recovery Act once we found out mid-March what the City's allocation was going to be. She has been trying to see if we could apply some or all of those funds to the Veterans' Center. She has made calls to HUD, Congressman Filner, Veterans Affairs, etc. The outreach services that the Veterans Center plans on doing affects veterans and military families who are within the targeted income range, etc. She believes we can pursue this funding, and she hopes to get positive information soon. Making calls to governmental agencies was very bureaucratic but she hopes to have information in the next couple of weeks. She realizes that will be a separate action for Council's consideration to get those funds with the priority to be for the Veterans Center.

COUNCILMEMBER SANCHEZ moved approval [of staff's recommendations and Document No. 09-D0282-1].

COUNCILMEMBER CHAVEZ seconded the motion.

Motion was approved 5-0.

16. **City Council: Approval of a substantial amendment adding the Homelessness Prevention and Rapid Re-Housing Program to the FY 2008-09 Action Plan of the 2005-2010 Consolidated Plan for Housing and Community Development, and authorization for the City Manager to submit the amendment to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development**

- A) Mayor opens public hearing – public hearing was opened
- B) Mayor requests disclosure of Councilmember and constituent contacts and correspondence – disclosures were reported
- C) City Clerk presents correspondence and/or petitions – no correspondence was received
- D) Testimony, beginning with:

JOHN LUNDBLAD, Management Analyst, stated this is actually the first of the Recovery Act programs to come before Council in the Recovery Act of 2009, aka the Stimulus Program or the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA). There were funds set aside for the Homelessness Prevention fund; the program as assigned to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) for the Homelessness Prevention and Rapid Re-Housing Program. It is related to but not really part of the CDBG program, as you will find with many of the Recovery Act programs.

The first step in this is the adoption, in HUD's term, of a substantial amendment which, in effect, serves as an application for these funds. So we will later come back to Council with a contract and a complete plan, which is why there is no financial report on this now.

The program is primarily for people who would be homeless but for this program. It is not for the chronic homeless; it is for the people who have been very negatively affected by the economic recession. It does not deal with mortgage issues. It really is to help people stay in their rental unit or, if they have had to leave one, to get them rapidly back into housing. So the first step is the submission of this substantial amendment in a form prescribed by HUD. We will receive about \$750,000 for this; 60% must be spent within 2 years, and we do not anticipate any difficulties in that. We will be working closely with the local school districts and with our partner nonprofit agencies to see that these funds are well spent. They will be limited to Oceanside residents. A goal is to maintain family stability and keep kids in school.

Public Input

DONNA MCGINTY, 2405 Mesa Drive, complimented John Lundblad on his knowledge of these items.

With no further input, the public hearing was closed.

COUNCILMEMBER CHAVEZ questioned the timing of this.

MR. LUNDBLAD responded that is one of our concerns. This amendment has to be submitted to HUD in about 10 days. They have promised to get a contract back to us quickly. We are looking to roll out the program by September 1. There is an unusual clause in most of the Recovery Act programs that we can start accumulating costs prior to a contract, conditioned upon the contract being signed.

COUNCILMEMBER CHAVEZ moved approval [of staff's recommendations and Document No. 09-D0283-1].

COUNCILMEMBER KERN seconded the motion.

MR. LUNDBLAD noted that one of the items being explored is to make this a loan program. We are looking at this because we know many of the recipient families are ones who do not want welfare, and they would rather do a loan and pay it back. We will bring that back to Council.

COUNCILMEMBER KERN said it seems to be for families with kids in school. What about the families where the children are not in school yet; and how do you reach those families.

MR. LUNDBLAD stated they would also be included. The priority is families with children in school; families with children; etc. They do not have to be in school. The goal is to maintain family stability. For those not in school, we will be working with other agencies who will all know how to refer people to this program.

Motion was approved 5-0.

17. **City Council: Adoption of a resolution increasing registration fees for the Mobile Home Rent Control Program**

- A) Mayor opens public hearing – public hearing was opened
- B) Mayor requests disclosure of Councilmember and constituent contacts and correspondence – disclosures were reported
- C) City Clerk presents correspondence and/or petitions – correspondence received
- D) Testimony, beginning with:

MARGERY PIERCE, Neighborhood Services Director, stated staff is recommending that the Council approve an increase in the registration fees specifically tied to the rent control ordinance and general oversight and administration of the adjustments. When this ordinance was adopted by the City Council, it was intended to be self-funded because it was a program that really benefited a special interest group. The fees have not been increased since 1991, at which time they were increased to \$54.04 per space per month. That registration fee is paid annually by the park owners; however, \$32.80 is passed through to the park residents, so the park residents also participate in the fee.

Over the years the registration fee, because it has not increased and costs have grown, has not been covering the expense of just managing the day-to-day program. For the mobile home rent control funds summary of July 1998 – March 2009, we received total fee revenue of \$1,336,250, along with transfers from the General Fund in FY 2005/06 and 2008/09 of \$407,812, etc. for total revenues at \$1,804,359. Our expenditures exceed that fee revenue. The money from the General Fund was necessary in order to cover costs associated with net operating income and special adjustments, which the registration fees are not able to cover by ordinance. The total expenditures totaled \$1,979,791. It needs to be clear that this does not cover the costs of special adjustments, and we will have meetings with the stakeholders and at some point come forward with a recommendation on a cost recovery plan in order to recover the expenses associated with special adjustments.

She reviewed that the expenditures are for personnel services [\$115,679], i.e. salaries/fringe benefits of the staff involved and workmen's compensation; non-personal operating expenses, i.e. mailings, consultants, building inspections, etc. [\$62,391]; and interfund service charges [\$119,705]. With these expenses, the cost of running the program is \$297,765.

With the gap in what we collect in revenues and the expenditure costs, the program has been subsidized by the General Fund. It had been designed to be self-supporting and not rely on the General Fund for the day-to-day operations of the ordinance. In order to bring the fee up to where it covers those day-to-day expenses, it would require a total \$132.34 per space per year. Staff recommends that the fee be increased from \$54.04 per space per year to \$132.34 and that the park owners will be able to pass through the \$67.68 to the residents. That is taking the increase and dividing it equally between the park owners and the residents. The residents in their rent bill would pay their portion in twelve equal payments.

During the Manufactured Home Fair Practices Commission (MHFPC) meeting, park owner representatives suggested that if the residents were allowed to pay on a monthly

basis that they too would like to pay on a monthly basis. So the Commission and staff would recommend that if the park owner wanted to pay in twelve equal payments, that would be fine. The goal is to cover the cost of administering the ordinance, so it is our recommendation to give that option to the park owners to pay monthly or quarterly, etc. as long as by the time the application for an adjustment is made, they have paid the registration fee in full before we would proceed with the hearing for any rent adjustment by the Commission.

- E) Recommendation – adopt the resolution increasing registration fees to \$132.34 per space, per year, for the period from November 12, 2009, to November 11, 2010, with increases based on the Consumer Price Index for subsequent years

Public input

JIMMY KNOTT, 127 Sherri Lane, stated this increase is nothing that we want, but it is something that we have to do. When the General Fund support is pulled out, it has to be made up by the homeowners because the park owners will take it out of the profit that we pay in our rents. We are paying for the ordinance. The rent control benefits park owners by not having to reduce rents but rather receiving increases. We do have a few of our seniors/families who are on a very fixed income with minimal social security who will need some help. We, within the community, are willing to pay this just to preserve this ordinance because it is such a value to us. We don't want to end up like Carlsbad — paying \$1,000/month or more.

FRANK MERRIFIELD, 200 North El Camino Real, Rancho San Luis Rey MHP, concurred with what Ms. Pierce has presented to Council. They get a 2.5 – 3% increase every year permissive adjustment afforded to the owners. He concurs to accept this proposal.

NORMAN KELLEY, 900 North Cleveland Street, Miramar MHP, spoke in favor of the registration fee increase. He is on a fixed income; we are in the middle of a recession; and he is asking Council to raise his fees, which demonstrates how important this matter is to many. Rent control is crucial to us, and staff is needed to manage the ordinance. The ordinance was originally intended to be self-supporting, funded by park owners and park residents. However, as staff said, the fee today is the same as it was in 1991 despite the impacts from inflation, salaries and overhead. We have this opportunity to get back on a pay-as-you-go basis without any impact on any other City programs. He urged Council's approval of the requested fee increase.

JULIE PAULE, with Western Manufactured Community Housing Association, Temecula, had submitted a letter outlining alternative approaches that she hoped Council would consider. We disagree that rent control is beneficial to park owners. The self-sustaining goal is good; however, it is not realistic. Few of these programs, as litigious as Oceanside's, are not self-sustaining and are subsidized by the City. Our preference would be to implement a fraction of the CPI increase as outlined without the 145% increase. As a side note, the rate of inflation over those 17 years has only risen 60% vs. the 145% increase proposed. If Council must proceed with the increase, a phased-in approach would be much less detrimental to the operations at your communities. We would prefer a 5-year phase in; however, if there is something more manageable with fewer years, any relief on that front would be appreciated. It is important to note that the City is walking a very fine line with the increase. The more the fee increases, the more of an incentive there is for the residents and owners to enter into a long-term lease agreement removing the space from the regulated space pool and therefore decreasing revenue to the City even more. If the City wants to limit the costs associated with the Ordinance, perhaps they should revisit the limits placed on rents and the manipulated market forces that the City places on turnover; any relief on these 2 fronts would dramatically decrease the costs associated with this Ordinance.

PATTI HEDDERLY, 900 North Cleveland Street, Miramar Community, is with the government committee. She stated it is very clear we need to keep the rent control ordinance self-funded. She, like Norm, is impressed with how the budget and everything has been handled up until now by the staff. We have received enormous support and help in the troubles we have with a lawsuit going on — a lot of which is our trying to defend the rent control ordinance. That is a forerunner of things we might be seeing in the City. We would like to keep the rent control ordinance in place. Thank you for supporting this ordinance.

With no further public input, the public hearing was closed.

COUNCILMEMBER SANCHEZ noted that at the Manufactured Homes Fair Practices Commission (MHFPC) hearing, staff made the points that there have been changed circumstances: 1) use of experts; 2) use of expert witnesses; and 3) there are fewer spaces. Therefore the City, over time, collected less. We received the official position of the owners. Do we have an official position from GISMO on this?

DIRECTOR PIERCE responded she had nothing in writing, but Tim Sheehan has been involved and is aware; she has not received anything not supportive of the recommendation. Mr. Merrifield is a member.

MR. MERRIFIELD responded GISMO has no official position on this. For OMHA, he believed the Board supported this position for acceptance.

COUNCILMEMBER SANCHEZ questioned any opposition from mobile home residents.

DIRECTOR PIERCE responded no, but there are concerns. They support the increase. She has not received any correspondence from anyone on their inability to pay this.

COUNCILMEMBER SANCHEZ stated it is difficult to increase fees. She does note the changed circumstances, which is the major reason for the adjustments - not so much inflation as much as fewer spaces involved. She is not sure about the request from the owners' representative to phase this in to take longer to collect.

CITY MANAGER WEISS received a copy of the letter and believed the representative had asked for 5 years but would be willing to accept something less if implemented over a period of time. If Council is inclined to look at a time payment, he would recommend a period not to exceed 3 years.

COUNCILMEMBER SANCHEZ questioned Ms. Pierce's recommendation now.

DIRECTOR PIERCE stated it is her recommendation that the staff's recommendation be approved in order to cover the costs of operating this program. Otherwise, the General Fund would need to continue to support it.

COUNCILMEMBER SANCHEZ moved approval of staff's recommendations.

MAYOR WOOD seconded the motion.

COUNCILMEMBER KERN is not thrilled about raising fees for anyone in this economic time. 145% is a big hit. He is more inclined to phase this in over a 3-year period; the idea is that we will catch up eventually. But right now 145% is out of line with the economy and what is going on.

He would make a **substitute motion** along the lines with what the City Manager recommended — to phase this in over a 3-year period; the other issue is determining new rents on turnover — staff can come back and clarify that and work on it more.

COUNCILMEMBER SANCHEZ wanted to clarify then that it is a friendly amendment motion and part of that motion then is to continue to allow the General Fund to subsidize it until we reach the third year.

DIRECTOR PIERCE responded that is correct. The General Fund would need to subsidize this program fairly heavily. She failed to previously mention that there would also be an automatic increase of 75% of the CPI annually.

COUNCILMEMBER SANCHEZ then noted that to phase this in is phasing it for both residents and the owners.

COUNCILMEMBER KERN confirmed that it would be phased in for everyone.

MAYOR WOOD asked the City Manager to comment since he has had conversations on this with the parties involved.

CITY MANAGER WEISS responded that the 3-year implementation would be the full increase, which is the equivalent to \$78+ increase in the existing fee, raising that fee to \$132 per year per space. The increase of \$78 would be split in thirds, so you would be looking at about \$26 per year over a 3-year period. In addition, each year you would have the CPI increase placed on that as well.

DIRECTOR PIERCE noted also the cost of any special adjustments would be a burden on the General Fund also.

COUNCILMEMBER SANCHEZ would accept the friendly amendment with the proviso that until we reach that third year we are covering this with the General Fund.

COUNCILMEMBER KERN stated what he wants to do is give a soft landing to everybody. Instead of raising it 145% in one year, that we cut that up into 3 years with a 3-year catch up vs. one year. We will figure out the other issues as they come along, depending on what the CPI is next year and the following years. We are trying to help everyone with this big hit. There are many programs that the General Fund helps with, and we will eventually catch up. It will be self-funding, but it will be gradual. That was part of his substitute motion.

COUNCILMEMBER SANCHEZ stated that it was a friendly amendment and she would **accept that friendly amendment with the proviso** that the General Fund will subsidize this until we reach the 3-year mark. She asked if the second concurred.

MAYOR WOOD, as second to the original motion, **would concur** to second the amendment/proviso. He noted he has talked to all parties involved—City, renters, MHP owners association, etc., and some of this cost is because of the outrageous rate increases requested by some of the parks and the experts needed to defend our MHP rent control issues. Fairness is understood, but part of this is caused by some of the actions of some park owners and their representatives.

COUNCILMEMBER CHAVEZ thinks the salient point is that the City Council is supportive of the rent control ordinance. Even in these tough economic times, this Council is willing to invest in maintaining the ordinance, which is contrary to a lot of misinformation promulgated throughout the City. The reality is that in his 7 years on Council he has never heard any Councilmember speak against the ordinance. He thinks Councilmember Kern's idea to phase this in is appropriate without being so onerous.

CITY ATTORNEY MULLEN wished to clarify an earlier comment about the General Fund still needing to continue to subsidize the special adjustment applications and NOI applications. He noted that the fees that are at issue on this item are not used to pay for those costs. If Council wished to address that, it would have to come forward as a separate item regarding those application fees. It is the application fee that is intended to pay for that process.

MAYOR WOOD noted that this is a compromise to some extent and, if we have problems and the cost to the City goes up on special issues, this will come back to Council to address the costs/fees. This is a compromise during this struggle with all parties, and it is unique in what is going on in the nation right now. If we still end up having to pick up large costs because of special increases, it will certainly come back to the Council to readdress this issue again.

COUNCILMEMBER SANCHEZ states that tonight we are supporting the ordinance for the next 3 years. We are agreeing that in order to enforce the ordinance, we mean to use General Fund money. With enforcement of any law we have, there is no possibility of getting all the costs back, whether it is police officers, code enforcement, etc. It is difficult to put a cost on some of the fees. She believes the mobile home park communities want to do their part in terms of the budget. She would like to see other entities do the same thing. We are looked to for assistance for those needing help, and we should be able support this ordinance.

COUNCILMEMBER FELLER noted we have 2,250 regulated spaces, and questioned how many total spaces are in the City.

DIRECTOR PIERCE confirmed the number and responded there are approximately 2,600 spaces in the City.

COUNCILMEMBER FELLER requested clarification on why we use 75% of the CPI.

DIRECTOR PIERCE reviewed that when the ordinance was written, it was 100% of the CPI. In 1991 it was amended to 75% of the CPI, and that is also when the ordinance was amended to allow owners to apply for a special adjustment if 75% of the CPI was not providing a fair return on investment.

Following comments on a recent special adjustment hearing by the MHFPC, **CITY ATTORNEY MULLEN** noted that the issues of special adjustment are not relevant to this item.

COUNCILMEMBER FELLER asked if the City collects for the previous year.

DIRECTOR PIERCE responded the City did not collect for the first year so that could logically be concluded.

COUNCILMEMBER FELLER hopes that is correct. We are limited, so he hopes in the future we can look for opportunities. He hates to impose any increases at this time.

COUNCILMEMBER SANCHEZ noted that with the Consumer Price Index (CPI), 75% is considered that portion of the CPI that deals with housing vs. other items such as food, clothing, etc. So it is the housing portion, which is why it is used in the ordinance.

Motion, as amended, with direction to staff to come back and clarify new rents on turnover, staff recommendations as amended to phase in over a 3-year period (with the proviso that the General Fund will subsidize this for the next 3 years), and amended **Resolution No. 09-R0284-1**, "...increasing registration fees for the Mobile Home Rent Control Program" was **approved 5-0**.

[Recess was held from 7:06 – 7:13 pm. Councilmember Feller was absent.]

18. [City Council: Adoption of a resolution confirming Planning Commission Resolution No. 2009-P12 and approving a Mobile Home Park Closure Permit, Conditional Use Permit (C-37-07) and Regular Coastal Permit (RC-22-07) to permit the conversion of a mobile home park to vacant land located at 514 Morse Street – Catalina Mobile Estates – Applicant: Catalina Mobile Estates, Inc. – John E. Grant

As announced earlier, this hearing is being continued to the May 20 meeting.

MAYOR AND/OR COUNCILMEMBER ITEMS

21. **Request by Councilmember Sanchez for discussion regarding budget priorities during worst recession since depression; review of Council policies related to budget; reserves; and direction to staff**

COUNCILMEMBER SANCHEZ stated we've been talking since around December about the budget, and one thing she asked for was an opportunity for the Council to give their budget priorities, taking into consideration the conditions we are in now. She has

been on Council 9 years, and every year we have talked about the reserves and the importance of putting funds away for a time when the economy is not as good. There were never any strings attached to putting additional funds in reserves; there was no discussion about one-time projects, etc. It was an understanding that at some point we may experience a situation where we have less coming in.

[Councilmember Feller returned to the meeting at 7:15 pm]

So, she wants to talk about priorities. For her, in listening to what the public's needs are, the idea is to keep as many people employed as possible and investing in the local economy. It is important to maintain a police force. Regarding our resources, if you are out of a job, you need help with resumes and a place to go like the Library, and cutting back on library services is not beneficial in assisting people. This is a time when there is less money, and seniors and youth are the most affected by this; we need to ensure the public welfare. In the last few years we have tried to do more. Each Councilmember has a vision of a better Oceanside and a different opinion on how to get there. When we had additional funds, we were able to do some future planning projects. She understood that the City has not done this in several decades — putting funds away to do future planning. At a time when we are having to pull back because we don't have the extra funds, those things we were never able to do are those we end up pulling back on and moving more slowly. For her, we need to ensure the public safety. So many things indicate that crime can quickly go back up. The City has lost 2 police officers and a lot of young people to gang violence. We have turned the corner with safety and our image to attract the kinds of businesses we want for Oceanside.

Number 1 for her is public safety, and she does not see how we can cut the Library and Parks & Recreation to the point where we may create more situations where crime could increase. Having recently retired as a Public Defender, she can say that when the economy goes down, the case loads go up. She wants public safety to have the support it needs to keep our crime rate down.

She knows we have created a fund for future planning in terms of Planning, Engineering and Building. When we are processing less projects, it makes sense to pull back in those departments and maintain the other services for our economic and public security. We should be able to go into our reserves. There is a turning point coming up, and this is a good time for us to do this.

COUNCILMEMBER CHAVEZ concurs on the importance of this Council's discussion on the reserves. Two weeks ago our Finance Director provided a document which talks about how we should establish a fund balance policy; in particular, how do you actually restrict reserves? They say you should determine the risk to the organization as far as revenue coming in. The document says that once you determine the risk, you should establish an amount. We should establish in our policy when we should use these reserves. We should also establish how we plan on replenishing the reserves and the timeframe. Those are the components of a fund balance policy. It is important we do this.

He asked the City Treasurer for any comments on the reserves.

CITY TREASURER FELIEN responded that from his 20+ years of experience in dealing with projections and budgets, his opinion is that the \$4,700,000 we have in undesignated reserves is barely a rounding error, and he would ask the Council to reflect on whether or not we are likely to have \$4,700,000 of bad or good news over the next 1½ years. When we compare the receipts, we are likely to get wise a wise the projections; we are far more likely to get bad news on all fronts — sales tax, property tax, etc. He would urge the Council to take a very conservative approach and keep that in mind.

COUNCILMEMBER CHAVEZ stated that regarding the priorities, it speaks to the larger issue of what is the role of the Council in establishing a budget. It is not the Council's role to get involved with micromanaging the departments' budget preparation. It is our role to set overall strategic and policy priorities for the City and to rely on the City Manager and his staff to make that policy direction happen. The Council did set strategic priorities for the City 4 months ago at a retreat. In the meeting public safety came out clearly as one of the high priorities for the City. He does not want to see front-line services affected if at all possible. Since he has been on Council, they have tried to add a couple of

police officers every year, and he is not interested in reducing the amount of safety in the front lines.

He also feels that Council discussion at its strategic planning session is that we need to balance the services we provide to the community; arts, culture, libraries, parks and recreation are all critical services we provide. We cannot and should not sacrifice key City services that improve our quality of life. Studies show one of the most critical issues is not so much about how much taxes people are paying but rather the quality of life that people expect. Quality of life is the Number 1 issue that defines our culture. Likewise, we need to continue our intelligent, long-term investment strategies in order to be positioned for the eventual economic turn-around.

At the Council's strategic planning session that we held, we prioritized updating the City's General Plan, developing an overlay for several key development areas — Coast Highway and Oceanside Boulevard - and developing long-term energy and water strategies, which he will ask to come back to the Council with after the budget in July, talking about our goals in water and energy. It is imperative that those efforts continue, especially during difficult economic times.

Our police and fire departments provide outstanding service to the community, and he does not want to see those services compromised. The City is facing difficult economic conditions, and he trusts that the City Manager, the Police and Fire Chiefs and all the City management team will bring us a budget that provides for the core services this City has to provide at a price we can afford to pay.

We should meet on reserves to determine a policy, and he is confident in the City's management team to think how to balance the budget, meet the quality of life and ensure a safe City.

Public input

JIMMY KNOTT, 127 Sherri Lane, complained that the budget workshops are held during the day, and he requested that be changed to allow community input for those who work. He encouraged attendance at the Treasurer's oversight committee meetings. In these tough times, he suggested using all the resources i.e. other government entities, etc. and look at the money as community resources to better use those resources to cover more needs. Also, government cannot do everything. We need to bring in the non-governmental agencies to see if they can help with the decisions. Council also has the right to redirect its reserves, plus the \$30,000,000 in other reserve funds, money from the investment portfolio, etc. Look at all the reserves and open this to the public.

DONNY MCGINTY, 2405 Mesa Drive, is fed up. You have good staff who are recommending that you practice a conservative approach. You have good staff telling you that the mobile home parks should not be subsidized by the General Plan, and the parks are in agreement and are willing to pay; but Council ignores staff recommendation and continues for the next three years, since 1991, to subsidize the mobile home park issue. She is on a fixed income too, and she does not like subsidizing people who are in the position she is in. She also then wants some of the subsidy.

Public input concluded.

COUNCILMEMBER SANCHEZ questioned the total reserves.

CITY MANAGER WEISS responded there is \$4,700,000 in undesignated General Fund reserves and approximately \$14,500,000 in a Healthy Cities reserve — with which Council has a policy that limits its use for up to a 90-day period. Also at the start of the year there was a capital projects reserve, but with completion of those projects, that fund will be exhausted. The funds were used for Mance Buchanon Park, Buddy Todd Park, and the Senior Center. So at this time in reserves it is roughly \$18,000,000.

COUNCILMEMBER SANCHEZ proposed that a conservative approach would be to keep the status quo. Cutting back on things in terms of planning is a conservative approach. If we are going to have public safety as Number 1, then we should not cut 3 lifeguard towers, which had 2,600 life-saving activities last summer. We should not cut the

one firefighter that is included in these cuts. We have had some bad fires, etc., and we need to maintain our public safety. Regarding response times, in a conversation with the City Manager, cutting back on lifeguard towers and then saying the Fire Department will make up the difference means we are affecting response times negatively.

CITY MANAGER WEISS believed the issue is the projections for next year, and with the information sent to Council this morning from the State, there is a potential for further reductions moving forward. At that point in time, Council would be looking at significant reductions throughout the organization.

COUNCILMEMBER SANCHEZ has concerns about response times; we had a 5-minute response time goal that Council set a number of years ago. So we need to revisit that since she is hearing that public safety is the Number 1 priority. At the workshops on priorities, we have never discussed the priorities with restricted funds. Those are the policy issues that Council decides. Throwing a bunch of projects on a list is what Council does; it is not the City Manager's job to guess which one of all the projects are the most important. Now is the time to decide this, which is a Council decision.

So public safety is Number 1, and she feels we should be able to use the reserves. Also on the agency is reviewing policies, so if there is a policy for 90 days, etc., we can change that. We have the reserves and a community that needs at least the status quo, which is what she proposes.

COUNCILMEMBER KERN noted that when he brought this up last October to set our priorities, Councilmember Sanchez did not attend that workshop in January. However, he is encouraged that she sees the value in this. Regarding going into the reserves, we do not know what is going to happen, and we may have to dip into the reserves even though we don't want to because we have to lock down the budget soon. We may get another hit like we got a short while ago with \$2,700,000. One thing from the League of California Cities is that the State is looking at taking 8% of our property taxes. That is a big hit. So we have to hold onto every single dime of our reserves for this next year. As he stated earlier, this is the easy year; next year will be tougher. Most of the ideas coming forward in the City Manager's budget were suggestions from the departments, because they are the ones that know where they can cut and keep it as far away from the streets as possible. That was the only instruction I gave to the City Manager was to keep the cuts as far away from the street and the core services we deliver as possible. That is the only direction I am giving staff. That was an item in the priority session that we maintain our core services.

Hopefully our next priority and goal setting session will be set when needed by the City Manager. He will not support dipping into the reserves right now because there is a hurricane coming. We may be here next year with no reserves and figuring out where to cut, so he cannot support using the reserves at this time.

MAYOR WOOD has no answers to this; he has never seen a budget like this at the State, and it indicates back to a depression. He sees the spiral effect where one thing takes out another business, etc. However, we are better off than a lot of other cities. We do not know what the State is going to do; they might come back and cut more of our funding. The initiatives on the ballot do not seem to have support, which would impact us.

He voted against the last budget, which was the easier budget. In other words, we did not know about the other \$2,700,000. However, in the easy budget we were already taking out a fire captain, a police officer, a dispatcher and some lifeguard towers, which he was concerned about. We should look at all options including the reserves. Next year may be worse, but maybe it will turn around. It is difficult to put a budget together when we do not know what will be taken from us by the State, etc. He looks to the City Manager and staff to come up with all the recommendations for Council's input. It is frightening to know that if we try to cut this \$2,700,000 out of this budget without going into reserves, we will be cutting people, which impacts the public and services. Something has to be done at higher levels and hopefully that will be the case for the turn around. He has already given his opinions where the cuts should be. Everything should be on the table with every possibility.

COUNCILMEMBER SANCHEZ stated we subsidize, meaning the General Fund pays \$5,000,000 for development services. We have been talking about development

paying for itself for the last 9 years, and yet we are still subsidizing developers at \$5,000,000 this past year. That does not make sense. Further, she has been part of a wish-list creating event almost every year for the last 8 years. She has never been asked by the City Manager to prioritize with costs, and Council won't support such a workshop. We have a portfolio of over \$180,000,000. We have reserves of about \$36,000,000. We have the ability to keep the status quo. She is not happy about the direction of this Council.

COUNCILMEMBER CHAVEZ stated we had a document provided to us by staff on development services on the amount of expenditures and revenue received over the past 5-6 years. As he recalls, Development Services raised about \$1,000,000 more than expenditures. He questioned Councilmember Sanchez's \$5,000,000 figure in subsidizes.

CITY MANAGER WEISS believed the report was over a 10-year period, and there was somewhat of a surplus; however we indicated that it is not a surplus because we have to provide the service for several years after that fee is paid. For example, when developers pay for building inspections, etc., they pay up front, but those services are not rendered for sometimes up to several years. There was no \$5,000,000 figure in that report.

COUNCILMEMBER CHAVEZ clarified that the \$5,000,000 is part of the misinformation. Regarding priorities for critical items, at the Council retreat in January, which Councilmember Sanchez did not attend, we identified then that we were going to have a critical budget this year. We knew in January there was a problem coming to us; it was a highlighted issue - with the economy we are looking at, what are the priorities? That is why we had the meeting in January. On May 20 we have a scheduled workshop to go over the budget that was put together by the City Manager and staff. We gave direction to staff in January, and now some are suggesting changing the direction after all the preparation work and advisory group input. Now is not the time to change direction to staff, not 2 weeks before the budget presentation on May 20. He agrees, we need priorities for critical items, and that is why we had the Council meeting in January.

Also, there is a lot of misinformation on the reserves which makes it clear that not all Councilmembers have read the booklet provided by staff. Councilmembers have a responsibility to review some of the information given to us by staff, particularly the Government Finance Officers Association booklet because of GASB 54, which establishes the policy on how City's operate. It is important we understand the terminology and what is a non-expended reserve, what is a restricted reserve, etc. That is something we should have a discussion on, and we should do that before the fall to make a policy to deal with the reserves.

What we should not be doing is not doing anything until a year from now. That is too late. We have been diligently working on this; we have a process going forward; on May 20 the public will hear it also; and we will be balancing the budget again. May 20 is one day after the election, which will probably change the whole situation again.

COUNCILMEMBER FELLER believes the City Manager will bring forward a priority list for us if we have severe enough cuts, so Councilmembers will have an opportunity to see a priority list. He is not in favor of using reserves.

INTRODUCTION AND ADOPTION OF ORDINANCES

The following items are ordinances for introduction or adoption by the City Council/HDB/CDC. Ordinances are laws of the City of Oceanside and require introduction and adoption at two separate City Council meetings (urgency ordinances are an exception, and may be introduced and adopted at one meeting as an emergency measure). The City Council/HDB/CDC has adopted a policy that it is sufficient to read the title of ordinances at the time of introduction and adoption, and that full reading of ordinances may be waived. After the City Attorney has read the titles, the City Council/HDB/CDC may introduce or adopt the ordinances below in a single vote. There will be no discussion of the items unless requested by members of the City Council/HDB/CDC or the public through submittal of a Request to Speak form prior to the commencement of this agenda item.

28. **City Council: Adoption of Ordinance No. 09-OR0286-1, "...authorizing an amendment to the contract between the City Council of the City of Oceanside and the Board of Administration of the California Public Employees' Retirement System (introduced 2/4/09, 5-0 vote; previously adopted 2/18/09, 5-0 vote)**

CITY ATTORNEY MULLEN wished to explain this item. We had received word from PERS that they wanted the formal adoption of this ordinance after the employee election. While Council has already adopted this ordinance, part of your action here in Section 3 is to repeal that previous formal adoption [of Ordinance No. 09-OR0101-1]. Essentially what you are doing is readopting what you have already approved.

Following the reading of the title, **COUNCILMEMBER CHAVEZ** moved adoption of the ordinance.

COUNCILMEMBER KERN seconded the motion.
Motion was approved 5-0.

Item removed from the Consent Calendar for discussion:

10. **City Council: Approval of Amendment 1 [Document No. 09-D0278-1] in the amount of \$25,000 to the professional services agreement with MainStreet Oceanside, extending the term of the agreement by an additional three months and adding to the scope of work services in specific areas of The Strand for July 4, 2009, and authorization for the City Manager to execute the amendment; and approval of budget appropriations in the amounts of \$25,000 from the General Fund Unallocated Fund Balance to fund the agreement, and \$10,000 from the General Fund Unallocated Fund Balance to the Harbor and Beaches Department for the rental of equipment for July 4, 2009**

DONNA MCGINTY, 2405 Mesa Drive, will continue to complain about the fact that you continue to issue tax dollars to an agency who is required to report to you how those dollars are spent in an appropriate manner. You still do not have the proper reports in your hands, and you are giving them another \$25,000. She has no faith in anyone at MainStreet to do a proper reporting to the City, which is why the Grand Jury is here now. Right behind them is going to be the Chamber.

COUNCILMEMBER FELLER moved approval.

COUNCILMEMBER KERN seconded the motion.

COUNCILMEMBER SANCHEZ asked specifically what the \$25,000 is for.

JANE McVEY, Economic Development/Redevelopment Director, believed some of it is rental of booths and equipment, some is fencing, and the infrastructure required to produce all the vendor booths, etc.

COUNCILMEMBER SANCHEZ asked for a list of items as the basis for the \$25,000.

RICK WRIGHT, Interim Executive Director – MainStreet, responded that the total budget is \$36,200. It contains \$25,000 from the City and an additional \$11,200 in booth revenue. The expenses are:

Equipment rental	\$ 725
Event consumables	500
Security	2,718
Venue custodial & maint.	2,485
Entertainment – Tyson St. South	1,000
Entertainment – Tyson St. north	1,500
Volunteer expense	520
Casual labor	2,000
Signage	782
Consultant – Nykiel	6,500
Consultant – Heim	5,630
MainStreet staff	3,827

Overhead		<u>6,300</u>
	TOTAL	36,873

COUNCILMEMBER SANCHEZ questioned Mr. Heim as a consultant if he is on the Board.

MR. WRIGHT responded that Mr. Heim has never been on the board. The consulting by Mr. Heim consists of doing the meetings with the police department, meetings with the vendors, making the plans, providing the drawings, and everything it takes to put together an event of this size.

Motion was approved 3-2, Mayor Wood and Councilmember Sanchez – no.

CITY COUNCIL REPORTS

23. **Mayor Jim Wood** – commented on events and issues. He also reported the passing of Betty Harding, previous Councilmember, who passed away on Saturday at 75 years.
24. **Councilmember Rocky Chavez** – commented on events and items.
25. **Councilmember Jack Feller** – commented on events.
26. **Councilmember Jerome M. Kern** – commented on events and the great reception for the President of MiraCosta College, Francisco Rodriguez, a week ago Monday. The event was underwritten by the Oceanside Jaycees, and it looks like we'll be able to give the Virtual Enterprise Class of Oceanside High about \$2,500. Also, he and Councilmember Chavez, as representatives to the educational community, will meet with Dr. Rodriguez and others to talk about how we can integrate the college more into the community, etc.

At SANDAG planning last Friday, items we recommended to the Board included \$160,000 for the Oceanside Blvd. specific plan that they will fund, and also \$60,000 for restoration of part of the Myers property at El Camino Real and Oceanside Blvd.

Yesterday Councilmember Chavez and I toured Diamond Valley Lake regarding the importance of water.

27. **Councilmember Esther Sanchez** - stated she attended the SANDAG energy working group that occurred April 23 and talked about pending legislation and what we will be recommending to the Board in terms of supporting pending energy legislation. We have also been discussing regional energy strategy principles and policies and climate action plan guiding principles and policies. At the next meeting we will finalize a list of pending legislation that we will recommend for support.

She shared an email received from City Manager Weiss that the expenditures for Engineering were \$2.4 million and the revenue was \$1.2 million. For Building it was \$2.1 million expenditures and revenues were \$1.4. For Planning, expenditures are \$1.5 million and revenue is \$1.4 million so they are not surplus at all. These figures indicate we are subsidizing these departments with General Fund money in the millions of dollars.

ADJOURNMENT

MAYOR WOOD called for a moment of silence for Betty Harding. He then adjourned this joint meeting of the Oceanside City Council, Community Development Commission and Small Craft Harbor District Board of Directors at 8:24 PM, May 6, 2009.

ACCEPTED BY COUNCIL/HDB/CDC:

Barbara Riegel Wayne
City Clerk, City of Oceanside